

REMARKS

The rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated June 2, 2003 have been carefully reviewed by the Applicants.

Claims 1-21 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 6336137). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the grounds that Lee fails to teach or suggest every element of the invention as claimed in Claims 1-21.

Independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 each include an element directed to "desired information." The specification explicitly defines "desired information" as "the end result of the information filtered by the server." In the present invention, the server actively filters the information requested by a mobile device. This element is neither taught nor suggested by Lee.

The rejection holds that Lee teaches filtering and compiling the information (col. 11, lines 23-28 and col. 12, lines 28-31). This is incorrect. The server of Lee performs all content

Serial No.: 09/607534

Examiner: VU, VIET DUY
Art Unit: 2154

selection and rendering in response to instructions that are passed to the server (col. 11 line 41 to col. 12, line 38). Under Lee, the server does not filter content, it returns what it is instructed to return. The "tags" of Lee are used as instructions that instruct the web engine on what data to return (col 12, lines 22-31).

In contrast, the server of the present invention filters content by examining the tags associated with information in a document that is requested by a mobile device, and excluding the content associated with certain tags from the information returned to the mobile device.

Under Lee, a server does not retrieve information from a network and dynamically assess the information. Under Lee, a user request is assessed, and information is obtained in response to the request. There is no provision for filtering.

The method of Lee is invoked by submitting a URL that has embedded tags (or tokens) that provide instructions to the server on the selection and formatting of information, and all requested information is returned to the user. There is no provision under

Lee for the server to withhold content from a URL request made by a mobile user. Content selection is wholly up to the user. In contrast, information requested in a URL in the present invention is passed through a filter, and may be excluded from the content returned to a mobile user.

Lee does not teach or suggest the element of filtering of information retrieved in response to a request by a mobile user, and thus does not anticipate the present claimed invention. In summary, Applicants assert that Claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit such action by the Examiner.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: September 2, 2003

M. Dean Matthews
Mehlin Dean Matthews
Registration Number: 46,127

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

408-938-9060

Serial No.: 09/607534

Examiner: VU, VIET DUY
Art Unit: 2154